

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,134	11/30/2000	Norbert Wolters	8874-US	2924
30689 7	590 06/20/2006		EXAM	INER
DEERE & CO		KOVACS, ARPAD F		
ONE JOHN DEERE PLACE MOLINE, IL 61265			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3671 DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/727,134	WOLTERS ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Árpád Fábián Kovács	3671		
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind ad will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Th 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-13,15 and 17-24 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) 8-13,15 and 17-19 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 20-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers	rawn from consideration. //or election requirement.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a constant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	ccepted or b) objected to by the ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:			

Art Unit: 3671

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: "wherein rotating ... element" should be "wherein the rotating ... element" (cl. 8, ln 7-8).

Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 09/727,134 Page 3

Art Unit: 3671

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegert (PCT WO 99/03323), in view of Thompson (2777267) and Pottinger et al (GB 2012154, cited by the applicant).

Wiegert discloses:

In re independent claims 1, 2, 20:

a feeding and picking device for feeding and picking a standing crop's individual plant stalks, the device comprising:

a rotating feeding element rotated about a vertical axis in a circle comprising a body with outwardly extending fingers (fig 4, ref 20);

a picking/gathering device (figs 4, 6, refs 10, 11) which separate useable parts from stalks;

an inlet is located in front of the vertical axis (see fig 4);

claim 3:

Art Unit: 3671

a snapping channel/gathering gap (31) wherein the feeding device covers the snapping channel (as shown on fig 4, the feeding device covers the channel);

two stalk rolls (ref 10, 11).

Wiegert discloses the claimed invention above including the fact the feeding element can be substituted by any other known devices (Applicant can refer to a translated copy, see Appeal Brief, or to an equivalent US Patent 6412259, column 2, lines 32-33), however Wiegert does not show or list the claimed alternative feeding device which grasps plant stalks as claimed.

Both Pottinger and Thompson disclose known devices for conveying the stalk, for example Thompson shows that the feeding device with finger (fig 1·2, ref 31), wherein the fingers of the upper element (for example ref 37) are directed away from a direction of rotation (as shown on fig 1) and the lower feeding element is beneath the upper feeding element and rotate the same direction as the upper one (fig 2, 3); and similarly Pottinger shows on fig 2 and 4, the same arrangement wherein the upper feeding element (bent times ref. 10 or feeding element(s) are shown, also see page 3, ln 114·115) are directed away from the direction of the feeding element; and the lower feeding element is beneath the upper feeding element and rotate the same direction as the upper one (fig 1).

Application/Control Number: 09/727,134 Page 5

Art Unit: 3671

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the feeding device of Wiegert with the alternative feeding device taught by either Pottinger and/or Thompson, in order to improve the lifting actions and support on stalks which may have been leaned forwardly by the agricultural harvester.

Art Unit: 3671

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 8-13, 15, 17-19 are allowed.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 5/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments (page 7, ¶ 5) against the references

individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually

where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231

USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's arguments on page 7, ¶6 and continuing on page 8,

It appears that the Applicant argues against Wiegert, when in fact a combination of

references, i.e. rotating feeding element as shown/provided by Pottinger & Thomson

is actually considered. The combination rotating feeding element's axis actually

placed to a position as claimed.

It is noted that picking/gathering device is not mistakenly identified, but it is

to use the terminology of the prior art, namely gathering rollers, thus

picking/gathering device as recited in the above rejection.

Application/Control Number: 09/727,134 Page 8

Art Unit: 3671

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Árpád Fábián Kovács whose telephone number is 571 272 6990. The examiner can normally be reached on Mo-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will can be reached on 571 272 6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/727,134

Art Unit: 3671

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Árpád Fábián Kovács Primary Examiner Art Unit 3671

ÁFK